

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

WE THE PEOPLE UNIFIED UNITED
STATES COMMON LAW GRAND
JURY

Case No. 3:19-cv-00533-MMD-WGC

ORDER

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES SUPREME
COURT, *et al.*,

Defendant.

Pro Se Plaintiff We the People Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury filed a complaint on August 26, 2019 but did not pay the \$400.00 filing fee or submit an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF No. 1-1.) Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb recommending that the Court dismiss this action. (ECF No. 3.) Plaintiff had until June 23, 2020, to file an objection. To date, no objection to the R&R has been filed. For this reason, and as explained below, the Court adopts the R&R and dismisses this action in its entirety.

This Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely objects to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, then the Court is required to “make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and recommendations is required if, but only if, one or both

1 parties file objections to the findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis in original); Fed.
2 R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court “need only satisfy
3 itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the
4 recommendation”).

5 Nevertheless, the Court conducts *de novo* review to determine whether to accept
6 the R&R. Judge Cobb identifies several defects in Plaintiff’s action. First, Judge Cobb
7 notes that Plaintiff seems to adhere to the “sovereign citizen” anti-government movement
8 by attempting to assert a claim “under ‘Jurisdictional Natural Law’ by United States Grand
9 Jury as a sovereign.” (ECF No. 3 at 1.) However, as Judge Cobb explains, courts
10 nationwide have rejected these types of “sovereign citizen” theories. (*Id.* at 3.) Judge Cobb
11 also finds that Plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee or to submit an application to proceed *in*
12 *forma pauperis*. Therefore, Judge Cobb recommends that this action be dismissed with
13 prejudice. (*Id.* at 4.) Upon reviewing the R&R and underlying complaint, this Court finds
14 good cause to adopt Judge Cobb’s recommendation in full.

15 It is therefore ordered that Judge Cobb’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No.
16 3) is adopted in its entirety.

17 It is further ordered that this action is dismissed in its entirety with prejudice.

18 The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment in accordance with this order
19 and close this case.

20 DATED THIS 1st day of July 2020.



21
22 MIRANDA M. DU
23 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28